

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the present amendments and following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 4, 11 and 13 are pending; and Claims 2 and 11 are amended. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added by this amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 2, 4, 11 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; Claims 2 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,774,660 to Brendel; and Claims 4 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Brendel and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,799,214 to Li.

With respect to the rejection of Claims 2, 4, 11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, the noted informalities have been addressed herewith. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

With respect to the rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

The applied art does not teach, disclose or suggest that the content servers transmit the content to the client if the client possesses a permission ticket to access the content servers, register information representing that the permission ticket used before that transmission is invalid, and deny the client if the client accesses the content servers but does not possess a permission ticket or the information is registered in the content servers, as claimed in Claim 2 and similarly claimed in Claim 11.

As shown in Figs. 13 and 14, orders of products over the Internet were sequentially allocated to respective content servers from a DNS server to perform processing of the orders, even if a certain content server had a particularly large load. Clients were instructed to directly access the content servers when ordering or downloading of software was

performed. However, when load to the content servers becomes very high, and restriction to connection was attempted, clients could ignore such restrictions and thus, appropriate load distribution would be difficult or impossible.

The Office Action admits that Brendel lacks specifying a time period to control an access using the permission ticket from the client. However, the Office Action asserts that Li makes up for this deficiency. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, Li merely teaches various CachePortal mirror sites 126 that are typically assigned an expiration time when the content is first copied. According to Li, there are several reasons for assigning expiration times. One reason is to ensure that mirrored content does not permanently occupy memory in the mirror site. Another reason is related to the business model. For example, content providers may only utilize the cacheportal system for a fixed period during each day. In such an example, mirrored content will be set to expire at the end of that fixed time period.

As such, Li describes assigning expiration times to mirrored content. However, the processing required for managing expiration times of contents as disclosed by Li is clearly different from that required for determining the validity of a permission ticket, as recited in the claimed invention.


As discussed at least on page 13, line 26 to page 14, line 6 of the present application, upon termination of the order processing, when information representing that the permission ticket used before that processing is invalid is registered to the content server, the content server can deny access performed by using the permission ticket registered as an invalid permission ticket. As a result, the fraudulent access appropriating in the issued permission ticket can be prevented. As discussed above, the applied art does not teach or suggest the features recited in the claims. Accordingly, the applied art cannot provide at least the advantages discussed above with respect to the claimed invention.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that there is no basis in the teachings of either Brendel or Li to support the applied combination. Certainly, the outstanding Office Action fails to cite any specific teachings in any of the references to provide motivation in support of the combination of Brendel and Li. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that the applied combination of references is a result of hindsight reconstruction in view of the Applicant's own specification, and is improper.

Consequently, in view of the foregoing discussion and present amendments, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Kevin M. McKinley
Registration No. 43,794

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

EHK:KMM\la

I:\ATTY\KMM\PROSECUTION WORK\214406\AMDT DUE 19DEC05.DOC